



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 103^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 139

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1993

No. 75

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 25, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Remind us, gracious God, of the uncertainty of life and our responsibility to be good stewards of the time and opportunities before us. May we be the people You would have us be in the days ahead and see the joyous opportunities to live lives that truly take seriously the responsibilities each has been given. May we be faithful custodians of all the blessings that have been given to us, whatever those gifts might be, and so may we use our time to serve people in their needs and seek reconciliation and peace with all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT]

will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EVERETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands; one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution designating May 30, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II."

NEED FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT MARKED BY MURDER OF MICHIGAN PRISON GUARD

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a prison guard at a Lansing correctional facility was beaten to death by a bunch of inmates. The saga of police officers in America being killed continues to go on at a record pace, and to make it worse, we now approach a record of 25,000 murders in America this year.

Prisons are overcrowded, and taxpayers are bankrupt trying to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to enact the death penalty for first degree murder. We have been coddling murderers too long, and we have been, in fact, denying victims any rights or protections. What do we now tell this family in Lansing, MI? That the murderer who killed your father and who had a lifetime sentence will be given another lifetime sentence?

This is unbelievable, and nobody in Washington is doing one thing about it. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to stop reading tombstones all over America and legislate and create some policy on first degree murder.

ODE TO A NEW DEMOCRAT

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an "Ode to a 'New Democrat'" by DICK ARMEY:

Bill Clinton was a president
Whose hair was white as snow.
And everywhere Bill Clinton went,
His hair was sure to grow!
To California he did fly
To talk of "sacrifice,"
While out there he cut his hair
And boy, did it look nice!
Christopher boarded "Hair Force One"
And charged two hundred bucks.
See, your new taxes ain't so bad,
Just two-and-a-half haircuts!
So pony up now, middle class,
He knows for you what's good.
His degrees are from the Ivy League.
His hair, from Hollywood!
Perhaps we've learned a lesson here.
Of "new Democrats" beware.
They care less about your tax burden,
Than they do about their hair.

TAXGATE

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the White House has vowed never to have another week like they had last week.

Remember last week we had both Hairgate and Travelgate, two little public relations gaffes that embarrassed the administration.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H2721

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the White House must prefer to have more weeks like this week. And this week we are going to have Taxgate.

Yes; this week the Democrats in the House will attempt to pass the largest tax increase in history. Taxgate will do more to harm the middle-class taxpayer than Hairgate, Travelgate, and all the other gates combined.

And after the Democrats pass this tax bill, you will see the White House claim this passage as a victory for the President. With victories like this, who needs defeats?

Mr. Speaker, we need an opportunity to stop the Clinton tax plan. Give us a vote on the Btu tax and the Social Security tax.

Let us stop Taxgate before it becomes a real scandal to the American taxpayer.

STRAIGHT TALK ABOUT TAXES AND ECONOMICS

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed hearing the limerick that was just cited by the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, but I have got to be honest with you: After you hear some of their proposals for deficit reduction, it is enough to curl your hair as well. I would resort to poetry, too.

Let us talk about what this is really all about. This is about, yes, a very large deficit reduction package, of which half, 1 to 1 at least, indeed a little better, comes from spending cuts. And they are going to be tough cuts.

Let us also be honest and forthcoming and say, yes, there are tax increases in there. Sixty-five percent come upon those who make over \$200,000 a year, 70 percent come up on those who make over \$100,000, and those under a certain level will not see a tax increase because of an earned income tax credit.

Finally, let us also recognize what the other side is not telling us. They are not telling us how they brought us a \$4 trillion deficit that we are having to contend with. They are not telling us about the lowest economic growth in the last 4 years since the Great Depression. They are not telling us about the lowest number of jobs created.

It is time to talk straight, Mr. Speaker.

WORKING AMERICANS CLIPPED BY THE BTU TAX

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, if you were in the air last Thursday, especially if you were flying to the Los Angeles airport, you might have been delayed because Air Force One was sitting on the tarmac while our President was getting a \$200 Hollywood haircut.

The rest of America was squirming, squirming about the President's Btu tax.

In my State of Illinois the tax foundation says that that very tax will cost 21,581 jobs, jobs to the middle class, to working people.

Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the American people are the ones getting clipped after all.

TIME TO ABANDON SUPPLY-SIDE ECONOMICS, PUT PEOPLE BACK TO WORK

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting sleight of hand going on. It is the kind of performance that Nehru would have loved. While our economy is in deep trouble, there are some who would like to get the people in this country to look to the side, someplace and not to the central issue.

The alternative that has been proposed to the President's proposal on reviving our economy would increase the burden on senior citizens and the poor, increase the burden on the middle class, and, yes, once again, a la the Reagan and Bush years, give a tax break to the oil companies and the utilities and the wealthiest in America.

The President has come forward with a proposal that is tough. It is not the 1980's. We cannot cut taxes on the rich all over again, once more, as you would like. It is time to undo the damage of supply-side economics and put Americans back to work with a program of diversification and conversion and investing in the future of this country.

Mr. Speaker, enough of this foolishness. Let us move forward with the President's proposal.

FLUSHING THE BTU TAX

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, while President Clinton's tax proposal may not be worth the paper it is printed on, if his tax plan is passed, that paper will be worth a good deal more.

That's because with the President's middle-class energy tax, the cost to make paper will increase considerably.

In fact, every consumer product will cost more. From grocery goods to toilet paper, the inflationary impact of the Btu tax will be devastating.

The direct costs of the energy tax per family will be \$471. The indirect costs are incalculable.

Mr. Speaker, we do not really need more taxes. The middle class pays enough. The poor pay enough. They cannot stand another hit.

We especially do not need an energy tax which will spur inflation and slow our economy.

Before Bill Clinton increases the cost of toilet paper, we should flush this tax.

We need a vote to strike the Btu tax.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

THE PRESIDENT IS WRONG

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the line out of the Clinton White House is if you vote against the President's tax bill, you betray the President.

I disagree. I say to my Democratic colleagues you do your President a favor if you vote down his tax proposal.

The President is lost, and he is too proud to ask for directions. He is heading down the wrong road, a road which will lead to higher inflation, higher interest rates, and slower economic growth.

Defeating the President's tax bill is the best way to tell him he is going the wrong direction. How do we know that his way is the wrong way? Because it was the same route taken by Jimmy Carter in 1976.

It is no crime to tell the President that he is wrong. This is not a monarchy. It is not a dictatorship. It is a democracy. And when the President is wrong, it is the duty of every American of any political party to tell him so.

Mr. Speaker, the President is wrong. We do not need more taxes. I urge my Democratic colleagues to send that message to President Clinton by voting against his tax bill.

THE PRESIDENT'S SUMMER JOBS PROPOSAL

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the Mayor of the City of New York addressed the Subcommittee on Human Resources. He came for a hearing, and indicated that in New York City he had over 100,000 young people that had signed up for summer jobs, and that he only had enough money for 30,000 summer jobs, which means that 70,000 young people will go without jobs this summer.

When we look at the package that has been put forth in terms of job programs, \$314 million, this would mean only an additional 10,000 jobs for the city of New York's young people, which means that there will be 40,000 young people with jobs and 60,000 with no jobs.

Mr. Speaker, something else that should be noted here is that this package creates 12,000 fewer summer jobs than the last year of the Bush administration.

As Mayor Dinkins stated, \$314 million for summer jobs is totally inadequate, and we must face up to this problem, and, as Spike Lee from my district said, we now must do the right thing.

TIME IS TICKING AWAY

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, this patriot pays enough: No more taxes.

Last week I came to the floor with this message from the patriots of America. Well, the Democrats haven't gotten the message yet. The minutes are ticking away till the Democrats bring up their tax bill to the floor, the largest tax increase in American history. And who will be hurt the most by the new taxes—the middle class.

I specifically recall hearing candidate Clinton on the campaign trail claiming he was going to cut taxes for the middle class. On October 19, 1992, he said "I will not raise taxes on the middle class to pay for my programs." It seems that since becoming President, Bill Clinton is experiencing memory loss. Now President Clinton is pushing a tax bill complete with an energy tax and new taxes on Social Security—taxes aimed at the middle class to pay for more spending programs.

More taxes, more spending, and a bigger government. That's what President Clinton's tax bill is all about. The minutes are ticking away for the middle class Americans. Prepare to open your wallets and watch your money disappear, because the Democrats' tax bill is gonna getcha.

AMERICAN PUBLIC, NATION'S JOB-LESS HOPE FOR MEANINGFUL LEGISLATION

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, the people in my home State of New Jersey had it all spelled out for them on the editorial page of the Star-Ledger, a statewide newspaper. "When you're out of a job, it's a recession. When I'm out of a job, it's a depression." With New Jersey's unemployment rate at 9.1 percent, the highest in the Nation, nothing could ring truer.

This week I am going to have to answer to real people at home, not statistics. I am going to have to tell the jobless people on the streets of Perth Amboy, Newark, Elizabeth, and Jersey City that although I have each time answered the President's call and each time made the tough choices, all we

will have to show for it is a share of an anemic, skin-and-bones stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President to keep fighting for people who want to work but can find none. I want to implore him to keep fighting to give them a chance, and not to let their hopes die amidst Republican rhetoric on the plush seating of the Senate Chamber, where everybody already has a job. Mr. President, put forth a meaningful job package, and the American public will be with you.

AN ODE TO THE MIDDLE CLASS

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, "An Ode to the Middle Class":

Roses are red,
Daffodils are flaxen
And President Clinton
Just keeps on taxin'
He promised the middle class
They'd get a break
But now all they've got
Is one big headache!
Their wallets are empty
And they find it strange
All that's in their pockets
Is some very small change.
And soon these poor taxpayers
Will have new burdens on their backs
If President Clinton
Gets his energy tax.
They're taxed for the deficit
They're taxed for the streets
They're taxed from their heads
Way down to their feet!
They're taxed, some may say
To cure all our ills—
But the truth of it is
they're taxed to the gills!

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION RESTRICTING HAZARDOUS WASTE INCINERATOR SITES

(Mr. HOLDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight legislation Congressman CLINGER and I have introduced concerning hazardous waste incinerators. And, I want to thank Mr. CLINGER for his leadership and hard work on this legislation.

The issue of hazardous waste incineration is of local and national importance. Local to my constituents in Northumberland County who are faced with this problem every day—and national to us since we have the ability to set requirements for incinerators.

One mile from my district is the site of a proposed hazardous waste incinerator. This site happens to be situated across the street from Allenwood Federal Prison.

As you can guess, this situation poses a tremendous threat to the community which would be endangered by an incinerator malfunction or other catastrophe. Residents, prison guards, and prisoners would have to be evacuated,

and prison officials have testified that an evacuation could not be accomplished swiftly and safely. I do not want to put the people of the Susquehanna Valley at risk.

There seems to be no rhyme or reason of how we can allow the siting of these incinerators near a prison, since a hazardous waste incinerator does not make a good neighbor to any prison.

To address this problem, Mr. Clinger and I have introduced legislation creating a 2-mile buffer zone around Federal prisons, prohibiting hazardous waste facilities from being built within this area.

This legislation is a first step in bringing some common sense to the siting of hazardous waste incinerators, since the risks are too costly for the people that live near these sites.

THE BTU TAX: HITTING THE POOR THE HARDEST

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, a column in yesterday's Roll Call said it all: "Clinton's Btu Tax Would Be Hardest on Poor Families."

That is right, Mr. Speaker. Despite Bill Clinton's warmed-over class warfare rhetoric, his proposed energy tax would hit the poor harder than anybody.

According to Bob Eckhardt, a former Democratic Congressman, poorer families pay four to five times more for energy per capita than rich and middle class families.

By increasing the costs of energy on these families, Bill Clinton's tax makes life harder for the working poor. Add in inflation, and you have a tax that will really sock it to poorer families. The working poor will feel the pain when Bill Clinton and the Democratic majority pass their energy tax.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will give us a vote to strike the Btu tax. We must work to lift this crushing tax from every American family.

And to my Democratic friends, especially those Democratic freshmen who promised a middle class tax cut, to all my friends who are considering voting for this attack on the poor and working poor—are you willing to go back to your districts and tell them you broke your promise and voted for this mess?

□ 1210

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S COMMITMENT TO STRENGTHENING AMERICA

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's deficit reduction and investment plan is the long-awaited antidote to counteract the

past 12 years of Reagan-Bush trickle-down, voodoo economics—which has caused average Americans, pocketbooks to run dry while cursing opportunities to those most in need.

It is high time we break this devastating spell. America can no longer afford to simply maintain the status quo along with the inevitable inequities such a situation perpetuates.

The President's plan reverses this disastrous do-nothing trend by locking in nearly \$500 billion in deficit reduction and bringing middle-class fairness back to our Tax Code. At the same time, the President's package injects much-needed investments into important programs such as Head Start, Women, Infants, and Children, childhood immunizations, and family preservation.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton came to office with a firm commitment to putting people first. Indeed, the President has worked diligently to keep this commitment in the face of obstinacy and cynicism. People, first, not big business, not the rich, but the people who made this country great: the worker, the homemaker, the student, the senior citizen, the average people who make this country what it is today.

NIH REAUTHORIZATION

(Ms. SNOWE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to rise in support of final passage of the conference report on the National Institutes of Health reauthorization.

There is no question what passage of this legislation, and its subsequent signing into law, will mean for American women:

It means there will not be any more breakthrough studies that include 22,000 men and no women.

It means that women's health will no longer be an asterisk in America's medical textbook.

It means that women will finally have answers to the questions we've been asking for the past many years that can mean the difference between life and death.

Members of the House, the consciousness of American women has been raised regarding the dearth of research on their particular health needs. And yet, as the incidents of breast and cervical cancer and osteoporosis continue to rise, more and more women are asking questions about their health out of concern and outright fear.

Mr. Speaker, the answer can no longer be, "We simply don't know." We must help to restore their dignity, and respect their desire for simple parity in the area of health research and funding.

The increased funding contained in this legislation for research on osteoporosis, breast, cervical, and ovar-

ian cancer, contraceptives and infertility, will provide the scientific underpinnings that will give women the answers they desperately need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to support passage of the NIH reauthorization today. It is the right prescription for a problem which is long overdue for a solution.

A WILLINGNESS TO PAY TAXES IF THE PURPOSE IS CLEAR

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience to observe that people do not like to pay taxes. That is a truism. That is a self-statement.

Occasionally, however, if the goal for which people are requested to raise taxes is sufficiently clear and sufficiently important, people are willing in fact, to pay taxes.

At home in Louisville, some several years ago, we voted for earmarked taxes for local public transit. I understand the State of California has passed additional gasoline taxes to improve the road system and uncork the traffic jams there.

President Clinton's proposal that comes up this week, the reconciliation plan, does have in it tax increases, but because they are targeted for deficit reduction and because they go into a trust fund for that purpose and because some type of a mechanism for either capping entitlements or for establishing an alarm bell system to monitor entitlement growth will be included, the money which is raised, along with the spending cuts which are included, will go to deficit reduction.

So I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that while people do not like to pay taxes, they will do so, if the purpose is good enough and the method is correct, and that is what we have in this reconciliation bill.

THE BTU TAX

(Mr. BACHUS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary visited Birmingham, AL, and in a speech in my hometown she characterized President Clinton's Btu tax as a, and I use her quote, "pissant tax."

Now, Secretary O'Leary used this vulgar term to indicate that this tax was nominal, unimportant or insignificant. But, Mr. Speaker, this tax will take \$500 out of the pockets of the average Alabama family.

That may not seem like a lot of money to Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, but I can tell my colleagues that that is a lot of money to the average Alabama family. It is money that

these struggling families need to pay for groceries for a month or more, to pay rent payments. When their children are sick, this is money that they need to take them to the hospital or for medical treatment.

In short, this tax is not nominal to the people in my district. Middle-class families are struggling. They need the tax relief promised by President Clinton, not more taxes. They do not have an extra \$500. To my freshman Democrats, I ask, is \$500 a nominal or insignificant tax to the families of their district?

Do the families in their district have \$500 extra? Do they need tax relief or a tax increase? Before you vote for the Btu tax, consider these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying that I ask my freshman Democrats, before they vote for this tax, are the families in their districts, do they need to pay more taxes or less taxes?

THE BIGGEST TAX INCREASE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today the Democrats are beginning their big push to pass Clinton's \$246 billion tax package, the largest tax in American history.

The sum of \$29 billion of the new tax will be taken from senior citizens. The senior citizens tax on Social Security benefits will be as high as 85 percent.

I have an amendment to stop the \$29 billion tax raid on our senior citizens. I ask every Congressman to help me protect Social Security from the big spenders, and my amendment will do just that.

And get this, at the same time that the Clinton administration is asking to tax Social Security, they are asking for an increase, an increase in foreign aid. I ask, isn't it time for us to take care of your own people and our own problems first for a change? Tax, tax, tax, spend, spend, spend is not the correct approach.

A senior citizen from Minocqua, WI, put it best, in my annual questionnaire, when he wrote back and said, "If it were up to Bill Clinton, he would tax the very air we breathe."

I can only add, and send the tax dollars overseas.

HAZARDOUS WASTE SAFETY ZONE LEGISLATION

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 2209, along with my colleague Congressman TIM HOLDEN, to address a major public safety concern. Under current law, hazardous waste incinerators can be built and operated literally next door to Federal prisons. This raises very serious health

□ 1220

and safety issues for surrounding communities, Federal prison staff, and prisoners given the potential for a hazardous waste accident.

This bill provides a 2-mile safety zone around Federal prisons within which no hazardous waste facility could be built that could require the evacuation of prisoners or other nearby residents. The intent of this safety zone is to provide a reasonable distance so that an emergency could be handled in a safe and orderly manner.

This legislation is prompted by a situation in my own district in which a proposed incinerator now under review is located less than one-half mile from the Allenwood Prison—which will soon house approximately 3,000 prisoners and employ 700 Federal prison officials. However, I understand that this same situation may be occurring in other parts of the country.

We have all heard or read about a number of hazardous waste accidents, including releases and spills. It took more than 2 days to evacuate a Miami prison after Hurricane Andrew. Without the proper precautions in place we could be endangering thousands of lives. I urge adoption of this legislation as a way to prevent a catastrophe from occurring before rather than after the fact.

PASS THE RECONCILIATION BILL NOW

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days, we will vote on the President's reconciliation bill. Let me be clear—his plan is the plan. We must pass it in order to give our new President the same chance many of us gave President Reagan 12 years ago.

The President's plan is a fair, progressive and realistic approach to cutting the deficit and funding some very important and beneficial programs. Other plans have been floated in the other body by a so-called bipartisan group. That plan, and others like it, seek to accomplish one thing—to kill the President's plan. In so doing, they seek to protect the wealthy, to reintroduce bookkeeping smoke and mirrors by quietly shifting costs to others, and to limit the ability of Government to encourage job creation.

The President's plan will cut the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years. It includes a \$75 billion tax incentive for investment and jobs. It includes an increase in the earned income tax credit, a program that encourages the poor to work.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand with the President and his package, it moves us in the right direction and prescribes a valid cure to our economic problems.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN MEANS A DEFICIT INCREASE, NOT DEFICIT REDUCTION

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the only game in town is not a good game, so we should not play it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are waking up to a lot of the political rhetoric that takes place here in Washington. A lot of the news media, a lot of individuals, call this a deficit reduction plan. No such thing. For the 5 years previous, from 1988 through 1992, the public debt increased an average of \$328 billion per year, mark that down, \$328 billion per year.

After raising taxes a record of \$332 billion over the next 5 years and having so-called deficit reduction, this reconciliation bill increases the public debt an average of \$360 billion per year for the next 5 years. It is not deficit reduction, it is increasing taxes and increasing spending. We are increasing the Federal debt from today's \$4.2 to \$6.2 trillion 5 years from now. Government overspending robs future generations of their chances for a strong economy.

The American people are waking up to what is important—let's hope the alarm clock goes off for Congress very soon.

RECONCILIATION BILL WOULD RESTORE FAIRNESS, CUT DEFICIT

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week the American people will be focused on the House as we debate the jobs bill and reconciliation.

My constituents in South Carolina and the people in the rest of our country want the Congress and President Clinton to reduce the deficit, to cut Government spending and to pump life back into the economy.

The President's economic plan will produce huge spending cuts and it will inject fairness into the Tax Code.

First, the reconciliation bill slices \$498 billion from the deficit over the next 5 years.

Second, the bill freezes discretionary spending to the 1993 level in each of the next 5 years.

On the revenue side, the bill restores fairness to the tax system.

Seventy-five percent of its taxes will come from people earning \$100,000 or more annually. Under this bill, the wealthy will bear the highest tax burden.

Mr. Speaker, the reconciliation bill restores fairness and it cuts the deficit. Support President Clinton's plan.

CALIFORNIA EIGHTH GRADERS ACTIVE IN ISSUES-ORIENTED PROGRAM, WIN COMPETITION

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the students of Ann Hanks' eighth grade class at St. Raymonds Middle School in Dublin, CA, who won the American Youth Citizenship Competition in the 10th Congressional District.

The statewide program, sponsored by the Walt Disney Co., is an academic competition designed to inspire middle school students to take an active role in government by examining a current issue facing their community.

These young men and women worked diligently on a proposed antismoking ordinance which is one of the toughest issues facing most of our cities today.

As winners of the district competition, the St. Raymonds class will receive \$100 and will have its portfolio entered in the regional competition. The St. Raymonds portfolio will then compete against winning schools from six other congressional districts. The winning school at each of 10 regional competitions will receive \$250 and an expense-paid trip to Disneyland to compete in the State finals on June 2-4, 1993.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the students at St. Raymonds and wish them the best of luck in the regional competitions.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S NAYSAYERS ARE WITHOUT A PLAN

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, we have a line here of naysayers, and they are all pointing holes in the President's plan. Anyone on this side of the aisle could do the same. Every one of us can point holes, but put up or shut up. Where is a plan that can pass?

A man from my party, the Senator from Oklahoma, came up with a plan. It is estimated it will get 20 votes in the Senate and 100 votes in the House. It is very easy to say no.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent 12 years saying no to everything as our country gradually slides down the drain. But the President, and we may disagree with specific parts, has had the courage to start putting this country in order and making us face the tough realities. We are going to try to do that here in the House as history is finally made.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the President told us at the White House he is going to fight for his plan. Go get 'em, Mr. President. Don't let parochial "what's in it for me" obstructionists fool the American people to protect energy producers. Your job is to do the right thing for the whole economy and

the whole country. If you make that fight, an awful lot of people sick of gridlock will be at your side.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair will remind Members that they should address the Chair, and not address the President directly.

A HAIL OF FAILURE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the early days of the Clinton administration have been marked by failure. The American people are closely looking at his failed economic plan. Everywhere I go people are saying, "Cut spending first," but Clinton fails to get it. He instead pursues failed old-time liberal spending policies. He is having trouble convincing his own party of the worth of his failing new tax program.

The people fail to sympathize with a failing President who fails to replace those failed taxes with spending cuts. Meanwhile, Bill Clinton is failing to keep his promises for middle-class tax relief. He is failing to stop illegal immigrants. He is failing to revive the economy. He is failing to keep his promise to cut White House staff, and failing to earn the people's confidence.

With all of this failure, what a shame it would be if the successes of the Clinton administration were built around new taxes, new spending, and more deficit. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help us this week to keep the President from failure in his new tax program, and vote against this tax program.

GIVE THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS A CHANCE TO SUCCEED

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind the American people of what happened over the last 12 years. From 1980 until now our deficit went from \$60 billion a year to \$330 billion a year under the Republicans, not under Bill Clinton, under the Republican administration. Now they want us to make sure that the President fails this week.

This is about the failure of Bill Clinton. That is all this is about. My Republican colleagues are not debating this on the substance. They want to embarrass this President, the President that you voted for, the President that you sent to office, and the President that you support. Give him a chance. Just like the Democrats gave Ronald Reagan a chance, give Bill Clinton a chance.

NATIONAL MISSING CHILDREN'S DAY

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, today is National Missing Children's Day.

I will never forget a young boy from St. Joseph, MN, Jacob Wetterling, who was abducted 3½ years ago.

The Department of Justice reports there are over 114,000 such stranger abductions each year.

How can we tolerate this widespread, horrifying threat to our children?

Mr. Speaker, 22 States, including my own State of Minnesota, have enacted sex offender registration laws. These laws are needed because these offenders repeat their crimes again and again. The typical child sex offender molests 117 children.

H.R. 324, the Jacob Wetterling bill, would create a national system of registration. This bill would require child sex offenders and abductors to register their addresses with police for 10 years after release from prison.

I urge all Members to join the 50 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle to pass a comprehensive crime bill which includes the Jacob Wetterling bill.

The children of America deserve nothing less.

EMPTY SLOGANS CANNOT DEFEAT A SERIOUS DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the reconciliation bill will pass. It will pass because it is a serious effort at deficit reduction, which we so badly need. The response, unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle has been slogans. I looked again at its proposals on the budget. It had within its \$119 billion in unspecified cuts, unspecified. It was an empty proposal.

It will also pass the House because we are not going to be hostage to the Senate. There is a bad mistake that the media, I am afraid, has not caught onto, and that is that no one person in the Senate can hold up the bill. If the Finance Committee in the Senate does not pass out a bill, the Senate Budget Committee under its rules can do so.

We in the House should do the right thing. I am confident in the end so will the Senate. The people will support a serious effort at deficit reduction, rather than the slogans that have been used to attack it.

□ 1240

WHITE HOUSE ACADEMY AWARDS NOMINEES

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's White House is off to a fast start in the race for next year's Academy Awards. A President so enamored of Hollywood has created a star-studded cast and crew right here in the Nation's Capital. The nominees are:

Best director: Harry Thomason for his own "Indecent Proposal"—an effort to can the travel office staff and have his own company take over the work instead.

Best actor: George Stephanopoulos, who every day is forced to utter half-truths, deceptions, and falsehoods all with a look of utmost sincerity.

Best choreographer: Dee Dee Myers, who dances around the truth at least twice a day.

Best actress: Catherine Cornelius, the President's 25-year-old cousin, who orchestrated the firing of the White House travel office and her own ascension to the top job.

Best supporting actor: William Kennedy, the White House counsel and Hillary's old law partner, who got the FBI to do the White House dirty work.

Best supporting actress: Janet Reno, who while not even realizing she was in a supporting role, was so out of the loop that she really made the lead players shine.

Best makeup: Christophe of Beverly Hills, the Presidential hair advisor, who charges \$200 per haircut, yet sticks the airlines with a \$76,000 bill.

Best new disaster movie: Hairport '93, a public relations fiasco for the White House.

Best song: "Don't stop thinking about tomorrow," Mr. President, because the first 5 months have been a disaster.

Best producers: Bill and Hillary, who so graciously allow these not-ready-for-prime-time performers to use the White House as their stage.

MILITARY BAN ON HOMOSEXUALS NOT A MATTER FOR COMPROMISE

(Mr. BUNNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot recently about a magic, compromise solution for the controversy about the President's promise to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military.

This so-called, don't ask, don't listen, compromise reminds me of those three monkeys with their eyes, ears and mouths covered with their hands so that they will "hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil".

There is no way to compromise this particular issue, folks. Homosexuals should not be in the military because it is bad for morale and efficiency. Our military leaders are virtually unanimous on that point.

Forcing our military leaders to cover their eyes and ears and mouths is not going to make the problem go away and it definitely is not going to make it work.

The ban should stay in place. Homosexuals do not belong in the military.

When something is wrong, pretending it isn't there, doesn't make it right.

CLINTON HAIRCUT SYMBOLIZES EXTRAVAGANCE, LACK OF CONCERN

(Mr. GRAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, for years, the symbol of Government waste has been \$700 hammers at the Pentagon. Well, now there is a new symbol: the Clinton haircut.

Now, it is one thing that the President spent \$200 of his own money on his hair. That may seem extravagant to most of us, but if that is the way he wants to spend his own money, that is his business.

What is more disturbing is that the Clinton haircut is estimated to have cost the airline industry \$76,000 in delayed flights. That is equal to the wages of three average working Americans.

While some dismissed the President's new "do" by saying he has "gone Hollywood," the more serious truth is that the Clinton haircut symbolizes the root problems of the Clinton economic policy.

First, it shows a passion for extravagant spending, the same kind of extravagance that sunk the President's stimulus bill.

Second, it shows that the President has little concern for the impact of his actions on the private sector. It is the same lack of concern we are seeing in the energy tax, striker replacement, and other job-killing measures.

And finally, it shows that the President has either no idea or no concern for what his policies will really cost. That is an alarming thought when you consider that the Clinton administration is about to engage in a hostile takeover of the insurance, student loan, and health care industries.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to get off his throne, kick out the hairdressers, and get back in touch with reality. The American people cannot afford a government of \$76,000 haircuts.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED TO SOLVE NEGOTIATED RATES CRISIS, FREE UP INVESTMENT CAPITAL

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, both Houses of Congress spent a great deal of time and energy

debating President Clinton's economic stimulus package. We talked about the need for such legislation, the timing of it and whether or not it would truly help the economy. As you well know, Republicans and Democrats did not agree on the answers to many of these questions.

However, there is an action that we can take which would free up \$32 billion in working capital where it would do the most good: in the checking accounts of hundreds of thousands of American firms. That doubles the amount of the legislation we just debated.

That means that we do not have to wait for slow government stimulus programs to move through the economy; that is a process that can take months and often years. In the past, we have seen that Federal stimulus funds arrive too late, jolting the economy long after the need for adrenaline was gone.

Presently, companies of all sizes, in every region of the Nation, are setting aside money to pay for legal costs and possible claims from irresponsible law suits brought by bankrupt trucking companies. The trustees for these failed firms are suing hundreds of thousands of companies, trying to gouge money by using a legal loophole.

It is time that the Congress took action and solved the negotiated rates crisis once and for all. We cannot allow unscrupulous trustees, lawyers and collection agencies to continue their multibillion dollar racket when their actions are clearly against the national interest.

It is time for the Congress to act, both for the sake of American industry and our economy.

THE BEAT OF A DIFFERENT DRUMMER: THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues across the aisle to march to the beat of a different drummer: the beat of the American taxpayer.

President Clinton is lobbying my Democratic colleagues to march with him to pass the largest tax increase in history.

But, Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle do not have to follow the President over the cliff. They don't have to be lemmings. They can see for themselves that more taxes are not what this country needs.

The political megaphone from the White House has increased in volume, but if you listen closely, you can hear the beat of the taxpayer's drums, and that beat is saying: Don't raise my taxes. Cut spending first, before you even whisper the word "taxes".

We can cut spending first, while not raising taxes. But first we need a rule that will allow amendments to strike

the Btu tax and the Social Security tax. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against a closed rule that precludes these amendments, to march to the beat of a different drummer, the beat of the American taxpayer.

□ 1250

THINK CAREFULLY ABOUT RAISING TAXES

(Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, later this week we will have a vote on the largest tax increase in our history. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to think about that vote very carefully.

Back in 1990 we were given the same reasons for supporting a huge tax increase that "Congress will commit to reduce spending if only we support the tax increase." Well, the taxes went up, and the deficit went up, and it keeps going up.

I do not know about your constituents, how they feel about more taxes, but my constituents, believe me, pay enough, and they are right. They already pay more taxes now at the local, State, and Federal levels than they have ever paid, and President Clinton wants the American taxpayer to pay more.

Think carefully about your vote this week on the rule and on reconciliation. History is a wonderful teacher. We need only go back 2 years to see what will happen if we pass this record increase. The economy will stay in the tank, the deficit will grow, and those who vote for the tax will be out looking for a new job.

IN HONOR OF FATHER AIDEN FOYNES

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Father Aiden Foynes, a man of tremendous dedication and love whose achievements will live on in the hearts of those who benefited from his counsel and his friendship for many years.

After 18 years as pastor of Our Lady of Queen of Peace Church in New Port Richey, FL, Father Foynes will be moving soon, bringing his talents and love to the congregation at St. Cecilia's in Clearwater. All of us who know Father Foynes thank him for his tremendous contribution to the growth of Our Lady of Queen of Peace and look forward to witnessing the power of his leadership at St. Cecilia's.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Father Foynes illustrates what one person with a fierce commitment can achieve in this world.

Born one of eight children to Michael and Ellen Foynes, in Butlersbridge, County Cavan, Ireland, Father Foynes was ordained on June 4, 1961. Immediately after ordination, he came to Florida at the request of Archbishop Joseph P. Hurley and served as associate pastor at St. Cecelia's. From there, he was assigned to Cardinal Mooney High School in Sarasota from 1963-68, serving also at the Church of the Incarnation. In that period of his life, Father Foynes studied during summers and obtained his master of arts degree in religious education.

Serving as an associate pastor at Our Lady of Lourdes Church in Dundee from 1968-69, Father Foynes then moved on to become the pastor of Espiritu Santo Church in Safety Harbor and also served as principal-president of Clearwater Central Catholic High School until the summer of 1975, when he became pastor of Our Lady Queen of Peace.

Under Father Foynes' direction, major changes took place at the church, beginning with the building of the parish center, which opened in 1980. In 1988, Father Foynes dedicated the fine new priest's residence across the street from the church. A fitting tribute to Father Foynes and the membership of Our Lady Queen of Peace was that the residence was debt-free on its opening day.

Those achievements were followed up with a residence for Sisters bordering the north parking lot and a three-bay garage and workshop to accommodate maintenance equipment and to provide work space for the Rosary Alter Society.

But Father Foynes' biggest challenge and achievement was the planning and supervision of the expansion of the church itself. Father Foynes insisted on retaining as much of the old as possible, seeking to build on the proud history of the church. The original stained glass windows, made in 1920, were retained, serving as stations of the cross. The altar table, tabernacle and lectern, all carried over from the old church were clad in rich carrara marble to match the sanctuary which is now 11 feet longer than the old building was wide! All in all, the seating configuration was improved to achieve eye-to-eye contact between every parishioner and the celebrant and both the lighting and acoustics were vastly improved.

Mr. Speaker, if we only celebrated the building record of Father Foynes, we would be reciting achievements for a long time. But even more important about Father Foynes is the impact he has had on the lives of the people he has touched.

A dedicated priest for 25 years, Father Foynes is not really leaving Our Lady Queen of Peace, he is spreading his love for people and his commitment to the future just a little farther. And as we celebrate with the parishioners of Our Lady Queen of Peace the tremendous achievements of Father

Foynes there, we anticipate anxiously the great deeds to come in his next phase of his dedication.

IT'S OBVIOUS, OR IS IT?

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the American people think the solution to our budget woes is obvious: Cut spending first. We spend more than we have, so we should be spending less. That is the way most American families approach their own budgets. Only in Washington could something so simple become so complex. In Washington we have important people telling us it is better to raise \$27 billion in new taxes from hard working American citizens than it is to cancel \$27 billion worth of services for illegal aliens. We are told it is better to raise more than \$18 billion from senior citizens than it is to make a modest, 3 percent cut in overhead costs for bloated Federal agencies; and they say it is better to raise another \$5.2 billion in taxes from middle America than it is to cut pork barrel highway demonstration projects. The list is endless. For every new dollar the President wants to raise from energy taxes and higher Social Security taxes, there is a dollar we could cut in wasteful or low-priority spending. Only in Washington does something so obvious become so confused, and so expensive for taxpayers.

U.N. CODDLING DICTATORS IN CHINA, MFN STATUS DEBATED IN UNITED STATES

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today Chinese human rights activist Shen Tong is holding a press conference in New York City to detail the Beijing regime's ongoing violations of human rights. In a shameful capitulation to the hardliners in Beijing, U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali barred Shen Tong from using the U.N. press club to brief reporters.

It is imperative that the world community take a strong stand against the kind of repression that is so rampant in China. The United States, as the leader of the free world, must make it clear that we will not employ a minimalist policy toward the Beijing regime. Such a policy would certainly be tantamount to coddling dictators.

Sadly, silent for months, the Clinton administration seems poised to announce such a minimalist policy with regard to China's most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status. The administration's consultation with Congress has been negligible on this vital human rights issue. If the President goes the route of a loophole-ridden Executive order, he will short circuit the opportunity for Congress to make it clear to

the Beijing regime that substantive improvements in human rights are absolutely necessary if China's preferential trade treatment is to be continued.

Mr. Speaker, much more is at stake here than another broken campaign promise. The women of China need to know that we will not turn a blind eye as they are forcibly aborted and sterilized. Religious believers must know that we will not stand by as they are beaten and killed for exercising their beliefs. China's brutal dictators also need to know that we will not tolerate the imprisonment, torture, and harassment of those who advocate democratic principles; nor will we tolerate the gross abuses inherent in Gulag labor, nor will we tolerate continuing violations of nuclear non-proliferation agreements.

Mr. President, I urge you to work with the Congress so that, together, we can send an unequivocal message to China's leaders that business as usual is not good enough anymore. Respect for fundamental human rights is a prerequisite for future favorable treatment from the United States.

ACT RESPONSIBLY TO REDUCE THE DEFICIT

(Mr. SANTORUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, we are here this week to debate the Clinton tax package and the deficit-reduction package.

I wanted to make sure that all of us here kept our eye on the ball of what was really at stake, and that is the future of this country and the deficit that we are faced with.

A group of fifth-graders at Ben Franklin Elementary School in what used to be my district reminded me of that point yesterday when they presented to me a check for \$240.35, money they raised at a bake sale and a car wash to reduce the national debt. They expressed their concern about the Federal deficit and what it will do to their lives, to their future, to their opportunities for them and their children.

I hope that the message is now sent clear that we have to act responsibly here in this Congress and in this city to reduce this deficit.

ENVIRONMENTAL ILLNESS FROM DESERT STORM

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we have a growing problem when our military forces that served in Desert Storm have been discharged or released from active duty with a standard medical clearance. This medical clearance precludes the possibility that some undiagnosed disease which later be-

comes chronic or fatal can be classed as service connected. There is growing evidence of multichemical sensitivity in certain individuals that increases the risk of serious complications from exposure to chemicals and other environmental elements. Within my district, a young man, Michael Adcock, an outstanding high school athlete—football player and State recordholder in weightlifting—volunteered for duty in Operation Desert Storm. During his tour of duty, he was exposed to a chemical agent resistant coating which was the apparent cause of all of his subsequent medical problems. On April 23, 1992, Michael succumbed to cancer—11 months after his return from Desert Storm.

Mr. Speaker, we must find a way to better screen our young people for possible service-connected diseases—either at the time of discharge or in a continuing program of followup examinations after discharge.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BUDGET PROCESS REFORM ACT

(Mr. COX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, over the last 30 years this Congress has run up a public debt of over \$4 trillion, and now this week in our reconciliation bill we will pass so much new spending that we will add \$1.2 trillion to the national debt. That is what the Clinton plan calls for, despite the largest tax increase in American history.

This ever-increasing public debt is the inevitable result of a badly broken congressional budget process that virtually guarantees financial chaos. That is why the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], and 125 of our colleagues have joined with me in introducing a bipartisan Budget Process Reform Act. The first tenet of this bill is that the budget itself should be a binding law, not the nonbinding concurrent resolution, that is virtually meaningless, that we presently use.

We end the practice of budget waivers, that notorious abuse under which in the last Congress over half of all spending bills waived the Budget Act in its entirety.

Every American who wants to restore fiscal sanity, who supports the principle that government should budget first and spend later, should support the Budget Process Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will explain how the Budget Process Reform Act will control entitlement spending.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN CUTS SPENDING

(Mr. KOPETSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of rhetoric on the floor today about what the President's tax plan does and does not do.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for some facts. The fact is that there are over 200 specific spending cuts in the tax package that include about 300 billion dollars' worth of spending cuts. There is a hard freeze on discretionary spending in the budget for a 5-year period, and, yes, there are tax increases. Just as the President promised while he was campaigning, he is going to tax millionaires in this country, and those folks on the other side of the aisle are opposed to taxing millionaires to help reduce the deficit. They are also opposed to raising the corporate tax on the 2,700 largest businesses in America from the current rate of 34 percent to 35 percent to help reduce the deficit.

The President's plan is about deficit reduction. They do not talk about that. They do not talk about how high the deficit would be if we do not pass the President's plan.

If they vote against the President's plan, what they are doing is voting against deficit reduction. This is the vote to do it. They are going to have to explain why they are opposed to deficit reduction.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1993

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 179 is the rule providing for the consideration of S. 1, the conference report on the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 1, the bill for which the Rules Committee has recommended this rule, is an important and long-overdue au-

thorization of the National Institutes of Health, particularly the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, and the National Institute of Aging.

Most importantly, the bill includes requirements to ensure that women and minorities are included in NIH-sponsored clinical research. To implement this policy of equity in health research, the conference report statutorily establishes the Office of Research on Women's Health. It begins to fill major gaps in women's health research through earmarks for research on breast and ovarian cancers and on osteoporosis.

S. 1 also statutorily authorizes the Office of AIDS Research to draw up and coordinate a comprehensive plan for AIDS research activities. Under the bill, the Office will direct how best to spend an emergency discretionary fund to focus efforts on the most promising AIDS research.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman DINGELL and Chairman WAXMAN for bringing back from conference this vital legislation that will safeguard the health of all Americans.

I ask my colleagues to support the rule so that we may deal with consideration of this important conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, the question was raised during the Committee on Rules' consideration of this rule as to why we are in such a rush to complete this legislation, the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993. We have just heard the gentlewoman from New York give us some of the important reasons and benefits that will flow from this legislation. And I think they have validity.

But I have to say that the rule did not really need to be granted just a few short hours after the lengthy conference report came back. There is a good deal in it, and it needed some opportunity to be considered, I think, more deliberatively than it was.

Nevertheless, we did ask that question exactly in the Rules Committee, "Why are we rushing this thing so?"

Frankly, the answer came back. It was very blunt, and it is a matter of record in the Rules Committee, and it is somewhat dismaying. The answer is, "We are doing this in such a hurry so that we will have something to talk about when we go home for the Memorial Day recess at the end of the week."

Well, I do not think that is a terrifically good explanation for rushing an important piece of legislation.

Taking this argument to its next logical step, I wonder if there may be some concern among the leadership that perhaps the constituents are not going to be particularly too happy about the massive new tax increase that we are also going to be talking about this week and which we may in fact vote on later this week.